

DESERET EVENING NEWS

Organ of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

LORENZO SNOW, TRUSTEE-IN-TRUST.

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING.
(EXCEPT SUNDAYS)
Office at Fresh Temple and East Temple Streets,
Salt Lake City, Utah.Charles W. Penrose, - Editor
Horace G. Whitney, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES.	
One Year	in advance, \$5.00
Six Months	" " 3.00
Three Months	" " 1.50
One Month	" " .50
One Week	" " .25
Sunday edition, per year	2.00
Single Copies	.10

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the Editor.

Address all business communications to THE DESERET NEWS, Salt Lake City, Utah.

NEW YORK REPRESENTATIVE:
E. A. Craig, - 41 Times BuildingCHICAGO REPRESENTATIVE:
A. Craig, - 87 Washington St.SAN FRANCISCO REPRESENTATIVE:
C. S. King-Sheridan & Co., 409 Examiner Bldg.

SALT LAKE CITY, - FEB. 15, 1900.

THE PERFDY OF IT ALL.

The local ally and apologist for the Ministerial Association of this city, in its efforts to malign the "Mormons" and misrepresent Utah, has been engaged for some time in its old business of attacking and slandering the Deseret News. This forms the greater part of its editorial labors. We do not intend to devote much time or space to this unprofitable subject, but will pay a little attention to its latest attempt to place this paper in a false light before the public.

Unable to substantiate, directly, the woeful mistakes and deliberate untruths contained in the Ministerial Address, our wrathful contemporary resorts to its common tactics. It sets up a straw dummy and proceeds with vehement onslaught to knock it down and stamp it into the mire. It first attributes to the "News" a statement which this paper did not make, and then pours forth a deluge of confused sentences at great length in refutation of its own hypothesis. Here is an illustration. Referring to the comments of the "News" on the Ministerial Address, it says:

"For instance, it declares that the statement in the address saying there was any specified condition that living in polygamy should be done away with as a pledge to obtain Statehood is a deliberate and premeditated falsehood."

Reference to the article in this paper which is thus distorted, will show that we said nothing of the sort. Our denial was directed against the statement in the address which declared:

"In the sworn testimony of the President and leaders of the Church, before the Master in Chancery, in order to recover the escheated property of the Church, they pledged their sacred honor or that polygamous relations already contracted should absolutely cease."

To this allegation, which everybody who has read the official report of the testimony given on that occasion knows is entirely untrue, the "News" made the following response:

"We have the full testimony before the Master in Chancery on the escheated property case, and it contains no promise of the kind mentioned. The questions propounded and the answers given were solely as to the scope and meaning of the Manifesto of September 24, 1890, as understood by the witnesses. There was no 'pledging of sacred honor' about anything. The paragraph we have quoted from the address was manufactured for deceptive purposes by its very authors."

Observe, the Deseret News was simply relying to the assertion that the alleged "solemn pledges," used so often to deceive the American public, were made before the Master in Chancery. Our contention was and is that no pledges of any kind, shape or form were made before that court, or required or asked for. Nothing in the nature of a "pledge" was then demanded or given. The gentlemen who were interrogated simply gave their understanding of the significance of the Manifesto, issued by President Wilford Woodruff Sept. 24th, 1890.

The Ministerial Address further stated that those "solemn pledges" before the Master in Chancery were ratified by "Mormon" conferences. In reply to that untruth, we quoted the exact language of the Manifesto, and the resolution adopted by the Conference. Neither the language of the Manifesto, nor that of the resolution, warranted the assertion in the Ministerial Address, and the date of the examination before the Master in Chancery proves beyond truthful dispute that the ministers' assertion is false. The Manifesto was ratified by the Conference Oct. 6th, 1890. The case before the Master in Chancery occurred Oct. 19-24, 1891!

All the ravings and slurs and outbursts of the Tribune against the "Mormon" people and their leaders, based on the sentence we have quoted from its editorial, amount to nothing but the belaboring of its own man of straw. It deals in "pledges," "pledges," "pledges" enough to set up a half a dozen pawn shops, only they are all of its own manufacture. We will now add that the "solemn pledge" of the people of Utah, if such it may be called, is contained in the State Constitution in the language required by the Enabling Act. There is no other, and it relates to but one subject—the prohibition of "polygamous or plural marriages," nothing less, nothing more.

We here repeat, however, the announcement we have made on several occasions, that the laws as well as the Constitution of the State are to be observed and respected, and that law-breaking is not countenanced by this paper or by the "Mormon" Church. Utah can regulate its own internal affairs without aid from the national government, and will doubtless do so of its own accord and in its own way. There is no need to misrepresent or exaggerate conditions here, and it will prove of no benefit to anybody.

When professed ministers of the Gospel get down into the mire in order to fling mud at a Church, which they desire to destroy because they cannot either convert its adherents or controvert its doctrines, it becomes necessary to show the character of the missiles they employ. No matter how false, and

vile, and vindictive they become, they find a consistent champion in our virginate and unscrupulous contemporary. To misquote the Deseret News and then proceed to attack its own distortions, is almost its every day employment. Is it not indeed a high-toned journal and a devoted friend to the "Mormon" people? Well did it put at the head of its present effusion: "The Perfidy of It All!"

THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE.

There is a controversy between the eminent scientist George Mivart and the Roman church of Great Britain, which is of interest as showing the position of a great religious body towards the alleged conflict between faith and science.

Dr. Mivart seems to have asserted that the views of the Roman Catholic layman are changing, and that the tendency is to exercise a severely critical judgment on the expositions of the clergy. His idea is to reconcile the church and the advanced sciences, and in the furtherance of this thought, he seems to have gone so far, that the church excluded him from the privilege of partaking of the sacrament.

The position of the Roman church is thus explained by a Catholic journal, copied by the Boston Transcript:

"The Catholic church believes that the power of guarding the doctrines of faith involves the power of animadverting on the conclusions of scientific investigators, when such conclusions touch on faith's domain. Though a nation does not own the waters of the sea or the vessels of a foreign power, still she exercises control over such vessels as soon as they come into the waters that lie around her shores. The government of the United States does not own an inch of territory in Venezuela, and yet it will not allow any other nation to take a section of that republic. In like manner the church does not interfere with scientists till they begin to push their conclusions into her territory. It is only when they menace the inheritance of faith that has been placed in her charge that she bids them withdraw. In the exercise of this authority she at times uses her infallibility. At times she does not. She did not use it in the case of Galileo, nor did she use it when she put some of Dr. Mivart's theological articles on the Index. We should indeed feel sympathy for the distinguished scientist if some of his scientific writings had been condemned. But it is hard to feel sympathy for a scientist whose theological investigations have been censured by a board of trained theologians."

This, of course, is the position the Roman church has always maintained. How such a distinction between theology and science can be drawn, except in matters that depend entirely on direct revelation, is not easily comprehended. Theology itself is a science, closely related to other sciences and drawing information, in fact, from every science.

Theology, like philosophy, aims at ascertaining the whole truth regarding God, man and the universe, and there can be no discrepancy between true theology and true philosophy, unless a truth can sometimes be a falsehood, and falsehood sometimes true. Scientists need the conservative influence of theology, not to be carried away with their fancy at every little step forward on their exceedingly difficult path, and theologians certainly need the light of science in order to solve at times the mysteries of the Scriptures, which often remain unintelligible, until some new fact in geology, archaeology, or history, is discovered. And so far, true science has but aided true theology. The two should never be at variance. One of the strong points of "Mormonism" is this, that it recognizes truth, no matter from what source it comes. This indicates its divine origin.

LORD ROBERTS' ADVANCE.

The most encouraging news, from a British point of view, since the outbreak of the war in South Africa, is the message received in London from General Roberts concerning the operations at Modder river. He reports that he has succeeded in crossing the Orange Free State border, and obtaining a position on the road to the capital of that country. He has driven the Boers before him and captured five of their camps, all with comparatively small losses.

It does not appear that a serious, or decisive engagement has as yet been fought, but this is looked for in a few days. It is confidently expected that a turn in events has taken place, and that from now on the news from Africa will be of a character different from that which has hitherto been obtained. Interest now is concentrated on the operations of Lord Roberts and General Kitchener. It is claimed that the country north of the Orange river does not lend itself easily to defense, and that the British, therefore, should have a comparatively easy road to Bloemfontein. On the other hand, before marching toward the Free State capital, the British would naturally have to dislodge the Boers from the strongholds they now occupy, and to guard their line of communication with very strong forces.

It would be premature to predict what course the conflict now will take. It is not known where General Cronje has taken up his position, nor what his plan of defense is. Still with the great numbers now in the field under the direction of Lord Roberts, it would be strange indeed, if the Boers should not be forced to retire to their mountain passes and there defend themselves as best they can against the invaders. Hitherto the war has been carried on on British territory. It is now on Free State ground, and the initial successes of the campaign now commenced, justify the hope of the London press of a series of good news from the scene of operations.

RUSSIA IN PERSIA.

The British public appear to place but little confidence in Russian declarations, that the Czar's government will not embarrass Great Britain during the present crisis. Russian troops, it seems, are steadily being massed on the southern frontier, and the supposition is natural that this is done for some aggressive purpose.

The Times, commenting on the subject, calls attention to the German activity in prospective railroad building, from the Mediterranean to the Persian gulf, and states that Great Britain may have to defend her "interests in the Persian gulf and southern Persia against the whole world."

For years Russia and England have

played the political game of chess for the control of Persian affairs. Persia excludes Russia from free access to the Indian ocean in that direction. While it has from the first been the ambition of the czar to obtain sea ports, Great Britain has used her influence at the Persian capital to check all Russian advances, and always with success. At last, however, Russia seems to have obtained the concessions needed to build a road across Persia, and it is asserted the enterprise will be carried out in the near future.

The fact that neither Great Britain nor Germany objects to this Russian plan is significant. There are rumors to the effect that the powers have decided to divide Persia between them, each taking charge of its "sphere of influence," as in the case of China. The Russian railroad to the Persian gulf would, in that case, be only the wedge by which to split the little kingdom up, Russia acting for the interests of the other powers as well as herself.

It is more than possible, though, that during the present crisis in Africa, Russia may deem the time opportune to secure more than her share of Persian "influence." In that case trouble may yet occur. As the Times states, Great Britain has interests in the southern part of Persia, and the gulf, which may have to be defended. Russia may obtain a harbor on the north side of the Strait of Ormuz, but Great Britain is likely to aim at the control of the strait itself, in order to close the gulf, as she has closed the entrance to the Black Sea.

Russia is great at the game of acquiring territory without firing a shot. She conquers by patience and diplomacy. If she succeeds in adding a large part of the Shah's domain to her territory, without war, her statesmen should be awarded the palm in any international contest for diplomatic honors. Russian history shows what a clearly defined policy, consistently pursued for generations can accomplish, even under adverse circumstances and against great odds. When Czar Peter launched his ship of state on the perturbed waters, there was but little probability of its ability to outlive a fierce storm. Russia then was half barbarous, and weak. Europe was against her several times. Her hordes were easily dispersed by the legions of western powers. But she fought and suffered defeat until she had learned to conquer. Now she has become a world power, through the faithfulness of her rulers in carrying out the legacy left them by their fathers. Evidently the mission of that country in the world is far from fulfilled. Russia is slow of growth. She may be destined to outlive even the most golden age of the civilization that now rules the kingdoms and nations of the world.

LAW, NOT GOOD LOOKS.

A remarkable law suit has been decided recently by Judge Schuyler, of Easton, Pa. It appears that one Alice Bartholomew sued Emory Speer for damages, the defendant having appropriated one foot of ground belonging to the plaintiff. A thousand dollars was the sum asked for, and although the property was only valued at \$16.61, the jury awarded the full amount. The judge then set this verdict aside and declared it to be:

"A verdict of the kind which the courts have been long accustomed to expect in actions for damages where, as here, an attractive-looking woman is the plaintiff and a mere man is the defendant. In such cases it is always the man that suffers."

The New York World in commenting on this case observes:

"What is surprising in this case is not that the jury should have awarded the plaintiff \$1,000 for her good looks, but that the judge should have had the courage to set aside an award based on the established custom of the American jury and on the invariable recognition of the good looks of the plaintiff as an element in all suits at law. But may we not be permitted to utter a plea in support of the learned judge? Would it not be better, on the whole, to have dull, prosaic questions of law—whether relating to property or to murder—decided on their merits and in accordance with justice, rather than to have the decisions of juries decided in favor of an 'attractive-looking plaintiff' merely on account of her pretty face?"

The deviation of the judge from an almost universal American custom may be surprising, but can it not also be set down as a sign of a popular awakening of a better understanding and truer appreciation of woman as a member of society? It has probably not occurred to the "chivalry" which the judge rebuked, that by making of woman a being irresponsible before the law, it virtually places her outside the class of rational beings. It treats her as "property." Masters used to be responsible for their slaves, as they are for their animals, and as parents are for their little children. It can certainly be no compliment to woman-kind to be placed in any of these classes. No law can be effective for good, as long as it excludes one-half of the human family from its operations, because such a practice has the appearance of a daily demonstration, that law is not founded on eternal justice but on the caprice of men.

The anti-trust people had a lively time in the closing session of the convention; but they expect to make the furnace seven times hotter for the trusts.

Thomas Scarvo of Indiana has been sent to jail for a year for drawing his pension in another man's name. His claim to the pension was good, however, and he will probably get forgiveness from the government for the other offense.

Senator Pettigrew of South Dakota has some consolation for being called a traitor in Congress. He has been thanked by a score of Massachusetts anti-imperialists for having placed himself in the predicament to be so stigmatized by his colleagues.

Latest dispatches from South Africa indicate that Lord Roberts' army was both too big and too wise to fall into any Boer traps on the Modder river; indeed, the traps seem to have been worked by the British, although the Boers kept out of reach.

Mexican discussion of the Nicaragua canal under American control notes

that the waterway marks the southern line of United States sovereignty. There is in this comment a clear suspicion that Central America will be annexed to the United States in time—a matter in which Mexico has deep interest.

Congress is to be asked to protect seamen from "land sharks" in Atlantic ports. On the theory that the willingly gullible have no complaint at being "gulled," there has not been much sympathy heretofore for those seamen who earouse till their wages are mortgaged to keepers of whisky shops.

Leading participants in the convention at Chicago this week think the work of the meeting was the beginning of the end. In view of the resourcefulness of aggregations of capital there is some question yet as to which end is referred to. It may be well to wait a while before counting the chickens that may be incubated from the anti-trust eggs laid thus far.

Ex-Consul Macrum makes a strong statement as to his treatment by the British while at Pretoria; but it is well to await investigation before demanding war against England. Nevertheless, there should be an inquiry; and if Mr. Macrum's statement either stands or is corroborated, there is sure to be an increase of anti-British sentiment in this country. If it should be demonstrated that the gentleman has been over-zealous in his assertions, the people are entitled to know it, so as to avoid drifting toward a sentiment that will hamper if not disrupt Anglo-American peaceful relations.

The preliminary announcement in Wednesday evening's "News" and the further details today, of Lord Roberts' advance into the Free State and his successful turning of the Boer position at Magerfontein, seem to justify the anticipation that success is now destined to perch on British arms in South Africa. The latest definite estimate of the Boer force between Modder river and Kimberley is about 11,000, with possible reinforcements of four or five thousand since; while the British, including the Kimberley garrison, must have close to 70,000, if, indeed, they do not exceed that number. The relative strength of these forces would seem to settle the result beyond all doubt, and at an early date; for, unlike the situation at Ladysmith, the British are not compelled to carry the Boer position, but can go around, relieve Kimberley, and then tie up the Boer army, if it remains, as securely as it has tied up Kimberley.

THE CANAL SCHEME.

Boston Herald.

It is certainly an indication of friendship and good will on the part of the English government to make the surrender that it is reported to have made at this time, when the subject of isthmian canal construction is a practical question before the American people, and it is a specially gracious act on the part of the English to make this surrender of treaty rights without asking for compensation in other directions, or, indeed, for anything but our guarantee of the absolute neutrality of the canal. It must be said that this was so manifestly the right thing to do that there was no other course left, but in matters of this kind it is not customary for nations, any more than it is for men, to surrender to others what are thought to be valuable rights without exacting an equivalent of some kind.

Baltimore Sun.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty which, by the new convention, is to be amended was concluded between the United States and Great Britain in 1850. It has more than once threatened to interrupt the friendly relations between the two powers concerned. Many arguments have been made in and out of Congress to prove that the treaty has lapsed and was no longer binding on either nation. It has been alleged time and again that Great Britain, by retaining control of certain territory in Central America, had violated the first article of the treaty. More conservative men, however, have held that unless a distinct abrogation were secured Great Britain's claim to a joint interest in the canal could not be ignored. Notwithstanding this fact Secretary Blaine was on the point of abrogating it and was only restrained, it is said, by the conservatism of President Harrison. It is also understood that Secretary Gresham was preparing to denounce the treaty in 1894, when Great Britain withdrew from the "Mosquito" settlement and satisfied the American authorities that Honduras was of no value strategically.

Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Those senators who hold that the occupation of the Mosquito coast by Great Britain, contrary to the stipulations of the first article of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, released the United States from any obligation to the treaty, will be likely to regard the Hay-Pauncefote agreement as entirely unnecessary and as conceding to Great Britain an interest in American affairs which does not belong to it. Evidently there will be haste in ratifying the treaty, whatever may be its ultimate fate.

San Francisco Chronicle.

But the treaty is fundamentally wrong in that it recognizes the principle of permitting the interference of any European nation in an American matter. Europe has been hitherto considered as in some respects a political unit, and as such it controls the Suez canal. The proposed isthmian canal is a purely American affair in which no nation of Europe has any right to a hearing. If the United States proposes to build the canal it is a matter between the United States and the Central American nation or nations across whose territory it is built. What they may agree upon is the business of no other nation. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty should be abrogated, and no other treaty made with any European nation on the subject. If it cannot be abrogated it should be denounced.

Chicago Times-Herald.

The life of the enterprise is in this disjunction. Hence the convention between Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefote with regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is born dying if not dead. For by that arrangement there is no relative gain for this country. The interests of all nations are advanced in like degrees. What does the privilege of doing the work and collecting tolls amount to under the circumstances? The financial benefits are problematical, the political benefits nil. If we are to have a neutral canal it is immaterial whether it is built by us, by Great Britain, by any other power or by any combination of powers. No government could lay much stress upon the investment as a business speculation for the direct profit of the public treasury.

Chicago Record.

A treaty between the United States and Great Britain modifying the Clayton-Bulwer treaty has been signed at Washington. According to the new agreement the canal control provisions

Sale all the Week,

Commencing Monday, Feb. 12.

Despite the great advance in Cotton Goods, we now offer to the public a new and full line of

ZEPHYR GINGHAMS

in elegant patterns at less than old prices, 12½c and 15c goods for

10c A YARD.

An elegant line of 12½c

Percales at 8½c or 12 yds for \$1.00

We also invite your inspection of our new line of

WASH DRESS GOODS,

DIMITIES, CABLE CORDS, JAPANESE CLOTH, BRAZIL CLOTH, FOULARDINE and PICOTTE SATIN ROYE, all of which we offer at the

LOWEST POSSIBLE PRICES.

Also Bargain Offers in

Embroideries, Swiss Nainsook and Cambric Edgings, Insertions and All-overs. The Finest and Most Complete Line of Nainsook and Swiss Sets ever shown in Utah is in our Store.

SPECIAL SALE EXTENDED ALL THIS WEEK.

Z. C. M. I.

T. G. WEBBER, Supt

FOR ONE WEEK ONLY.

Boys' Leather Gloves, Lined, 20c, worth 30c.
Initial Handkerchiefs - 10c, worth 15c.
Men's Leather Gloves - 30c, worth 50c.
Ladies' Black Mitts - 15c, worth 30c.
Ladies' Fascinators - 25c, worth 40c.
Linen Collars - \$1.00 doz, worth \$1.50.

CUTLER BROS. CO.,

36 MAIN STREET.

ENTERPRISING BUSINESS MEN

know the importance of being well and suitably dressed, and those who haven't time to give their attention to such matters also know the importance of having a first-class tailor to go to who makes it a study to obtain the choicest fabrics for their selection, and to fashion a suit of clothing or overcoat in the latest and most correct styles, at such prices as

Suits to Order, \$25.00.
Pants to Order, \$7.50.

CALL ON US AT 235 S. MAIN ST.
Established 1874

BUCKLE & SON,

TAILORS AND WOOLEN DRAPERS.

LORENZO SNOW, Pres.

GEO. Q. CANNON, Vice-Pres.

GRASS CREEK

COAL—COAL

COAL

From the Celebrated Old Church Mine.

JUST WHAT YOU WANT

\$4.75

If you are tired of Soot and Clinkers.

Per Ton, Delivered.

USE GRASS CREEK COAL, FOR SALE BY

C. W. CLAYTON,

PHONE 255,

Office and Yards, 2nd South and 3rd West.

MASON & KIDDER,

PHONE 742.

Office 74 West Second South Street.

For Prices on Car Load Lots, Address Grass Creek Coal Co., Coalville, Utah.